

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

4-5-1976

Academic Council Meeting Minutes, April 5, 1976

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(1976). Academic Council Meeting Minutes, April 5, 1976. .

https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/270

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

April 5, 1976

Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice Provost Murray at 3:15 P.M. in room 155 of the University Center.

Present:

S. Barone, K. Boas, C. Benner, E. Cannon, J. Castellano, W. Collie, B. Dreher, E. Duffy, J. Fortman, I. Fritz, R. Frommeyer, G. Graham, R. Gray, R. Kegerreis, E. Levine, J. Martin, T. Matczynski, C. Montgomery, H. Neve, N. Nussbaum, G. Pacernick, H. Roehm, D. Schmidt, G. Skinner, E. Stearns, J. Thatcher, G. Torres.

Absent:

D. Badaczewski, J. Beljan, S. Dyer, K. Kotecha, A. MacKinney, A. Moliterno, A. Spiegel, B. Yoder, J. Zamonski.

Before moving into the first item of business, Mr. Murray introduced the new student member, Michael Miller. Mr. Miller was recommended by the Student Caucus to replace Sandra Dyer who has graduated.

- II. The Minutes of the March 1, 1976 meeting were amended in the following respect: The Curriculum Committee Report, which ended with the sentence, "The explanation behind that is listed in the aforementioned minutes" is amended to read "The explanation behind that is listed in the aforementioned minutes. See attached." Attached hereto, marked Attachment A, is copy of the Curriculum Committee Minutes of February 23, 1976. The March 1, 1976 Minutes, in all other respects, were approved as written.

- III. Report of the President.

Mr. Kegerreis reported that the University received word just today that the final decision of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is to accredit Wright State at all the levels under review, namely, continuing accreditation at the Master's level without any conditions, approval for accreditation of the first professional doctoral degree, namely medicine, and to re-review the institution in five years or until we have other substantive change.

The second matter Mr. Kegerreis reported on was the establishment of the President's Advisory Task Force on Academic Program Planning.

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Two

This task force is to develop and recommend guidelines to be used as a basis for developing new academic programs, to recommend priorities for those new programs and to recommend criteria for controlling the growth of, the maintenance of or the discontinuance of existing programs. Messrs. Arthur MacKinney and Robert Dolphin are the co-chairpersons of this task force. He asked the faculty to consider seriously the work of this task force and to lend them whatever advice and evidence that you may want.

The third matter Mr. Kegerreis brought to the attention of the members was a proposed Schedule of Student Fees for the University to begin Summer Quarter. He asked Mr. Murray to explain the Schedule of Fees (Attachment B). He asked that the Council members address any and all questions that they have on the matter either to him or to Mr. Murray for a specific response or explanation.

Mr. Murray then reported that since last September, the President has had presentations on the budget to students, faculty, staff, the Board of Trustees and others associated with the University. As a result of these meetings, the President received 180 different recommendations in regard to cost reductions, revenue increases and improvement of academic planning. The Schedule of Fees was a result of these recommendations. Mr. Murray then proceeded to explain the rationale behind each of the fee proposals. The Fee Proposal will be presented to the Board of Trustees on April 14, 1976. An open meeting will be held with the students on Tuesday, April 13, 1976.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee. Mrs. Dreher reporting.

The Steering Committee met last month and discussed with Mr. Nicholson from Faculty Affairs, the proposal for a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee. It will come to the floor in just a few minutes so discussion will come later. Student Caucus has given the Steering Committee the name of Mark Porter, the student who will act on the Constitutional Revision Committee. The addition of a student member to that faculty committee was passed by the Academic Council at the March 1, 1976 meeting. The Agenda Committee will be meeting on April 21, 1976, to put together an agenda for the Full Faculty Meeting. Please send memos if you have an item that should come before the full faculty at their May 11, 1976 Quarterly meeting.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Collie reporting.

The University Curriculum Committee had no formal report other than to advise that they will begin weekly meetings beginning April 7, 1976.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Nussbaum reporting.

Mr. Nussbaum called everyone's attention to the two-page document (Attachment C) which was distributed at today's meeting, one which tabulates the response to the Faculty Questionnaire on Fringe Benefits; the other, for recollection purposes, identifies the items that are indicated in the tabulation, so that A-1 would be the first item under Paragraph A on the cover sheet and so on. The tabulations were accomplished by taking the individual score from 1 to 10 that was requested of the faculty member and adding those dividing by the total number of responses to come up with an average score per item. If a numbered rating was not indicated then that particular item on that particular questionnaire was not counted. This is the reason for the variation in the number of responses reported. In addition, there were some twenty-five questionnaires that were non-usable in the sense that they were returned with every item checked or some items checked. In other words, not the usable quantitative score. The results would indicate that since one was highest rating, ten was lowest, the total average score with the lowest rating would be item B-1, which is the item for the initiation of prepaid dental insurance as an additional fringe benefit. Item C-1 has the lowest faculty rating. Namely, the development of Alternative Retirement Programs. Others fall pretty much in the average rating and it's obvious that B-1 has a very high faculty interest rating.

C. Library Committee, no report.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Sayers reporting.

The Student Affairs Committee will be meeting tomorrow at 3:00 P.M. We will have an item report by the Student Affairs Committee coming up under Old Business concerning a university-wide faculty evaluation procedure which the Student Affairs Committee hopes will be adopted by this body.

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Four

VI. Old Business:

- A. Approval of proposal from the Student Affairs Committee concerning a university-wide faculty evaluation procedure (Attachment A to the Agenda).

Moved and seconded that this document be approved.

Mr. Nussbaum stated that since the Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee had requested that the Student Affairs Committee transmit to the Faculty Affairs Committee their recommendations on this matter three months ago, and since the Faculty Affairs Committee has just received for consideration this recommendation at the last meeting of the Steering Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee requests that item be tabled.

Moved and seconded that the Motion be tabled.

Motion to table passed by voice vote.

- B. Return from table, cover resolution concerning Faculty Retrenchment (See Minutes of February 2, 1976 meeting).

Moved and seconded to return from table.

Motion to return from table passed by voice vote.

Mr. Nussbaum moved that the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to propose an amendment to the recommendation which calls for the establishment of a Faculty Budget Review Committee. The amendment reads: "That the Academic Council establish a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee composed of at least all members of the Steering Committee of Academic Council. This Committee shall be involved in the ongoing process of reviewing the budget at the university level".

Motion seconded that the Academic Council establish a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee.

Question was raised as to whether this included all members of the Steering Committee. Mr. Nussbaum replied "at least all members of the Steering Committee". Question was raised as to how this would relate to the present Budget Review Committee. Mr. Nussbaum stated

that there were positive plans for relating this committee to the proposal on faculty retrenchment but this will come in the form of another separate motion.

Mr. Skinner addressed Mr. Kegerreis that he was concerned that there should not be too many committees looking at the budget. He went on to ask if the present Budget Review Committee included faculty and representatives from other components of the university.

Mr. Kegerreis stated that it did.

Mr. Skinner said he was concerned about these two committees being merged rather than having another committee to deal with.

Mr. Kegerreis reported that he has not made any move to reconstruct the existing Budget Review Committee until this matter has been resolved within the Academic Council. He stated he would have to examine the representativeness to see if constituencies are adequately represented. If the Academic Council is going to formalize such a committee then Mr. Kegerreis stated he could work with it by adding people on an ad hoc basis so that it would not be necessary to have two budget review committees simultaneously.

Mr. Nussbaum stated that the committee proposal originally offered was an attempt to achieve representation through an election process. The discussions that went on between the Chairman of the committee and the Steering Committee indicated to their satisfaction that the Steering Committee was an elected body although, perhaps, indirectly, since they were elected by this Academic Council and, therefore, the representation could be considered to be broadly based enough to satisfy the original objectives of the proposal. However, Mr. Nussbaum indicated that he did not wish to impose that burden on the Steering Committee alone and, therefore, the supposition that other members could be added is included in the recommendation.

Mr. Murray pointed out that at the present time, there are two committees that review budgets. The Steering Committee, for the past three or four years, has been reviewing all the academic budgets. Then there is a university budget review committee that reviews all budgets and there are representatives from the Steering Committee that serve on this university budget review committee.

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Six

Mr. Nussbaum stated that they would propose that for university-level budget review that the total membership of the Steering Committee be employed. If the Steering Committee has been reviewing academic budgets up until now, certainly they can continue to do this.

Dr. Murray confirmed that this would not preclude this.

Mr. Nussbaum pointed out that a number of the problems in this area were generated by the fact that the last revision of the Constitution and Bylaws has never been codified and distributed to the faculty at large and the only existing documentation they have on the duties of the various committees is in a document that is now out of date. He would recommend that the codification and distribution be accomplished as soon as possible, especially since another Constitution and Bylaws Committee is about to begin work. It's difficult for the faculty to make input when they're operating two to three years behind the times, in terms of the information available to them.

Mr. Murray asked Mr. Falkner what the target date for completion of the Faculty Handbook was.

Mr. Falkner was unable to supply the date but did state that it is in Printing Services.

Motion that the Academic Council establish a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee was passed by voice vote.

Mr. Nussbaum moved that in the Faculty Retrenchment Policy document, the name "Faculty Budget Advisory Committee" be substituted for the name "Budget Review Committee" wherever appropriate.

Motion seconded.

There was a great deal of discussion as to this point.

Mr. Murray said he would support the motion since it's the faculty that's being retrenched and he felt an appropriate name would be Faculty Budget Advisory Committee.

Mr. Schmidt said he would have to be against it if the name would be used to exclude students.

Mr. Nussbaum said he could only answer to the student question that he simply indicated that the membership be at least the Steering Committee, others could be added. As far as the name, the proposal

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Seven

is one being generated by a faculty committee to a faculty group for what is identified as a faculty concern, so the word faculty is in the name.

Mr. Schmidt said it seemed to him that the faculty is already represented in the budgetary process.

Mr. Nussbaum stated that it had been pointed out that the Steering Committee is used to review the academic budget but not the university budget as a whole.

After much discussion, Mr. Murray asked Mr. Nussbaum to rehash the composition of the committee as the Council members had just voted on it before.

Mr. Nussbaum replied the committee would include at least the members of the Steering Committee, and anyone else that the administration might care to add. He stated they were not specifying how this should be done, merely that the minimum representation would be at least the members of the Steering Committee.

After more discussion, Mr. Murray called for a second to the Motion.

The motion was seconded.

A roll call vote was called.

In favor of approval of the motion:

S. Barone, E. Cannon, J. Castellano, W. Collie, B. Dreher,
J. Fortman, I. Fritz, G. Graham, R. Gray, E. Levine,
J. Martin, T. Matczynski, H. Neve, N. Nussbaum, G. Pacernick,
H. Roehm, E. Stearns, J. Thatcher, G. Torres.

Opposed to the motion:

K. Boas, E. Duffy, R. Frommeyer, C. Montgomery,
D. Schmidt, G. Skinner.

There were no members abstaining.

The Amendment passed by a vote of 19 to 6.

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Eight

Mr. Murray said that before they moved on to the next item of business, he would like to suggest to the Sgt. at Arms that he include him (Mr. Murray) on the roster as a voting member.

Mrs. Dreher said that Mr. Murray was voting for Mr. Kegerreis since he was not there at the time the vote was called. When he is not here, Mr. Spiegel is voting for him.

Mr. Fortman asked if they could ask for some appropriate body, he wasn't sure whether it would be the Steering Committee or the Faculty Affairs Committee, but for somebody, however, to sit down with President Kegerreis to try to iron out the mechanism of relationship and interrelationship so that the current Budget Review Committee does not represent anybody any less than what they are now, but that this committee either be included within it or something. He merely wished the interaction and mechanism to be clarified.

Mr. Murray said he agreed. He thought this would have to be worked out.

C. Approval of new courses (See Attachment C to March 1, 1976 Agenda).

Mr. Murray stated this was Attachment C to the March 1, 1976 Agenda. These course changes were all changes to PU gradings and/or for General Education credit which requires the approval of the Academic Council. He called for a motion.

Moved and seconded.

The motion for approval of the courses passed by voice vote.

VII. New Business:

A. Election of Steering Committee representative to serve remainder of term for Mr. K. Kotecha (Attachment B of Agenda).

Mrs. Dreher nominated Herbert Neve, Religion, to serve the remainder of Mr. Kotecha's term on the Steering Committee.

Motion seconded.

Academic Council Minutes

April 5, 1976

Page Nine

Mr. Murray called for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations from the floor. Mr. Murray called for a vote.

Passed by voice vote that Herbert Neve serve the remainder of Mr. Kotecha's term on the Steering Committee.

Mr. Murray asked if there were any other items of new business.

- B. Mr. Fortman asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Student Affairs Committee both meet on the matter of the Faculty Evaluation in the coming month and that the Faculty Evaluation be returned as Old Business at the next meeting of the Academic Council.

Mr. Murray asked if there were any other items of new business.

There was no other new business.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

/es